

REMARKS

The Office Action of October 22, 2004 has been carefully considered. In response thereto, the claims have been amended as set forth above. Reconsideration and allowance in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3, 5-8, 10, 12-14 and 16-19 were rejected as being anticipated by Horne. The remaining claims were rejected as being unpatentable over Horne in view of Demos. The claims have been amended to more clearly define over the cited references. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In particular, claims 1 and 12 have been amended to recite that decoding of the enhancement-layer input stream is controlled based on a *user-defined* subset of the base-layer output stream. No such feature is believed to be taught or suggested by the cited references.

The subject matter of claim 11 has been canceled and incorporated into claim 10. Claim 10 relates to the embodiment of Figure 3 of the specification described at page 8, lines 16-21 of the specification.

Claim 11 was rejected as being unpatentable over Horne in view of Li. The rejection states in part:

[L]i discloses an enhancement method, device and system including enhancement layer input stream corresponding to a user selection, pattern recognition, color recognition (See Li, col. 1, lines 25-28, lines 51-54, and col. 3, lines 28-33). [I]t...[would have been obvious to modify] Horne by incorporating Li's teachings in order to provide layer input stream corresponding to a user selection, pattern recognition, color recognition...to [provide] an efficient scalable method with increased resolution as taught by Li....


This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 10 as amended calls for selectively decoding the enhancement-level stream based on a defined region of a field of view of a camera system, the defined region of the field of view being based on at least one of a user selection, a location parameter, a pattern recognition, and a color recognition. Li contains no such teaching.

In general, Li pertains only to image encoding, not to image decoding. Of the particular portions of Li cited, col. 1 describes conventional MPEG2 image encoding, including the use of special bit patterns to mark the beginning and ending of a logical section and the use of macroblocks consisting of four 8x8 luminance blocks and two 8x8 chrominance blocks. Li does not teach or suggest any such use of these features as claimed in claim 11. Col. 3 describes selective transmission of M out of N possible enhancement layers depending on network load. The omission of an enhancement layer cannot be considered to be the same as or similar to selectively decoding the enhancement-level stream based on a defined region of a field of view of a camera system, the defined region of the field of view being based on at least one of a user selection, a location parameter, a pattern recognition, and a color recognition

Withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of claims 1-10 and 12-20 is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,


Michael J. Ure, Reg. 33,089

Dated: January 17, 2005